

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on September 14, 2004. Claims 29-57 are pending.

1. Response To Objections To the Specification

The Office Action objected to the disclosure because the disclosure as originally filed contained a hyperlink. Applicant amended the specification to remove the hyperlink. Applicant further amended the specification to conform with USPTO format regulations. No new matter has been added.

2. Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action objected to the listing of references in the originally filed specification as an improper Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant encloses a proper Information Disclosure Statement and respectfully requests that the cited references be made of record and considered by the Examiner.

3. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-28 are rejected as allegedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has canceled claims 1-28, and therefore, the rejection is moot.

4. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-14 and 16-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Trostle (U.S. Patent No. 5,919,257). Applicant has canceled claims 1-28, accordingly the rejection is moot.

5. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Trostle. Claim 15 is canceled, and therefore the rejection is moot.

6. New Claims

Claims 29-57 have been newly added to further define and/or clarify the scope of the invention. Applicant points out that Trostle fails to disclose every element of pending claims 29-57, and therefore Trostle fails to anticipate claims 29-57.

Trostle discloses a method for identifying changes in executable programs by comparing a hash value of the executable program with a trusted hash value. Trostle fails to disclose at least the element of inserting a system identifier into an object or extracting the system identifier to compare the extracted identifier to a stored identifier. Thus, Trostle fails to anticipate the pending claims for at least these reasons.

7. Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 29-57 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles Vorndran, Reg. No. 45,315

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500